Exhibit 26

Omnibus Mao Declaration

Message
_____

From: Chris Palmer [palmer@google.com]
Sent: 6/21/2016 8:47:23 PM
To: Sabine Borsay [sabineb@google.com]
CC: Lucas Garron [lgarron@google.com]; Emily Schechter [emilyschechter@google.com]; Aaron Stein
               [steina@google.com]; Stephan Somogyi [somogyi@google.com]; Alex Ainslie [ainslie@google.com]; Wieland
               Holfelder [holfelder@google.com]; Mark Larson [mal@google.com]; Parisa Tabriz [parisa@google.com]; Ben Wells
               [benwells@google.com]; ✶ Varun Khaneja [vakh@google.com]; Adrienne Porter Felt [felt@google.com]; Joel
               Weinberger [jww@google.com]; ▮▮▮▮ (core members) [▮▮▮▮@google.com]; Maximilian Walker
               [maxwalker@google.com]; Chrome Privacy Muc [chrome-privacy-muc@google.com]; Dominic Battre
               [battre@google.com]
Subject: Re: [▮▮▮▮] Google "Incognito" Precision

I've already made my case (for 5 years now), and so won't bore you with a meeting. :) But please note that
nothing will be more scannable than the name and the icon, both of which are a poor fit for what the feature
actually provides.

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 1:40 PM, Sabine Borsay <sabineb@google.com> wrote:
I've stated this already on a related thread -- Eric Schmidt's exact statement was written in our Security &
Privacy one-pager comms doc. So he most likely didn't go through a thought process concluding that
misinterpretation about how Chrome Incognito works, but just learned the points from comms doc. Over the
last couple of years, we've run numerous user studies on user perception and expectation and while some users
do have some misconceptions, it seems less widespread than you assume. But stay tuned, we're working on a
redesign of the Incognito NTP with two main goals: 1.) better scannability of the content around what it does
offer and what it doesn't, 2.) illustrating the use case it does support. The reason why I mentioned that our
messaging is pretty clear was to highlight that the only proactive comms I could imagine would be to explicitly
call out the differences between Allo's and Chrome's Incognito mode. Again, if Chrome Security team wants to
post something on the Chrome Security FAQs, we can draft something together with PR. Let me know.

I don't think we should abandon the Incognito mode brand because of the Allo launch. Happy to discuss more
in a meeting.

On 21 June 2016 at 22:34, Lucas Garron <lgarron@google.com> wrote:

On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 1:21 PM Chris Palmer <palmer@google.com> wrote:
Although our Incognito messaging is clear, people (everyone from internet randos to bug reporters to Eric
Schmidt)

Although it feels like I'm just piling on to Chris's comments, I think this cannot be understated.

Even Eric Schmidt couldn't even keep the core meaning of Incognito straight **when it only meant one thing**.

generally haven't understood it. So it's not clear enough. I suspect the confusion arises due to the tension
inherent between https://www.chromium.org/Home/chromium-security/security-faq#TOC-Why-aren-t-
physically-local-attacks-in-Chrome-s-threat-model- and what Incognito offers.

And although we and they have clear messages, Allo effectively ruined the clarity of our message by using
our name for a thing that is very different from our thing.

GOOG-BRWN-00410884

We should proactively communicate about this. But we should also abandon the Incognito name, and change Incognito to "Temporary Mode" or whatever else you like. Allo's definition of the term is much stronger and makes much more sense.

I don't know how proactive we should be, but we should definitely have good answers ready about the distinction, and the decision to use the same name.

(And/or use this as a chance to rebrand Incognito in Chrome, which has always been an over-reaching name. But that won't be as easy, and sounds like it is counter to our lofty branding desires.)

> On Tue, Jun 21, 2016 at 12:49 PM, Sabine Borsay <sabineb@google.com> wrote:
> Happy to work with PR on comms for this. Though I was not planning to do proactive comms about the distinction to Allo's Incognito mode, since we're already pretty clear in our external comms (Help Center, Incognito NTP, etc.) about what Chrome Incognito does offer and what it does not offer. And our agreement with the Allo team was that they're clear about the functionality of their feature as well. Do I understand it correctly that the Chrome Security team however want to publish proactive comms around this? If so, I'm happy to collaborate on the draft. Let me know!
>
>> On 10 June 2016 at 01:45, Emily Schechter <emilyschechter@google.com> wrote:
>> + steina and somogyi from the Security PR perspective
>>
>> Do you know who the right folks are to work with here?
>>
>>> On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:57 PM, Lucas Garron <lgarron@google.com> wrote:
>>> *volatile and isolated from regular profiles
>>>
>>> Higher-level folks, are we allowed to put something like this on the security FAQ? Do we need sign-off from anyone, and how would we get it?
>>>
>>>
>>>
>>>> On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:52 PM Chris Palmer <palmer@google.com> wrote:
>>>> On Thu, Jun 9, 2016 at 3:40 PM, Lucas Garron <lgarron@google.com> wrote:
>>>>
>>>>> Should we add something to the Chrome Security FAQ?
>>>>
>>>> I'm afraid the only correct thing we can say is "Incognito in Chrome has no technical relation to Incognito in Allo. They both give you better privacy than their respective regular modes, relative to the pragmatic threat models we have selected."
>>>>
>>>> How about:
>>>>
>>>> "Although Allo and Chrome both have features that go by the same name and use the same logo, they are designed to support very different threat models and use-cases. Allo's Incognito mode employs end to end encryption, which is an additional layer of encryption for messages above and beyond the TLS Allo uses for transport. Chrome's Incognito mode is designed only to ensure that local browser state is volatile, and makes no further guarantees of confidentiality (such as confidentiality from 3rd parties or of network traffic)."
>>>> --
>>>> You received this message because you are subscribed to the Google Groups "▮▮▮▮▮ (core members)"

PRODBEG: GOOG-BRWN-00410884
PRODBEGATT:
PRODEND: GOOG-BRWN-00410886
PRODENDATT:
PRODVOL: PROD029
2nd_CROSS_BEGBATES:
2nd_CROSS_ENDBATES:
AllCustodians: Sabine Borsay
TO: sabine borsay <sabineb@google.com>
FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>
CC: emily schechter <emilyschechter@google.com>;aaron stein <steina@google.com>;-
        joel weinberger <jww@google.com>;maximilian walker <maxwalker@goo-
        gle.com>;lucas garron <lgarron@google.com>;mark larson <mal@googl-
        e.com>;parisa tabriz <parisa@google.com>;alex ainslie <ainslie@go-
        ogle.com>;stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>;ben wells <benwell-
        s@google.com>;" █████ (core members)" < █████ @google.com>; ☆ v-
        arun khaneja <vakh@google.com>;wieland holfelder <holfelder@googl-
        e.com>;dominic battre <battre@google.com>;chrome privacy muc <chr-
        ome-privacy-muc@google.com>;adrienne porter felt <felt@google.com-
        >
BCC:
CONFIDENTIALITY: Confidential
CROSS_ALLCUSTODIANS: Sabine Borsay
CROSS_ATTACHMENTNAME:
CROSS_BEGATTACH:
CROSS_BEGBATES: GOOG-CABR-00149426
CROSS_CC: emily schechter <emilyschechter@google.com>;aaron stein <steina@google-
        .com>;joel weinberger <jww@google.com>;maximilian walker <maxwalk-
        er@google.com>;lucas garron <lgarron@google.com>;mark larson <mal-
        @google.com>;parisa tabriz <parisa@google.com>;alex ainslie <ains-
        lie@google.com>;stephan somogyi <somogyi@google.com>;ben wells <b-
        enwells@google.com> █████ (core members)" < █████ @google.co-
        m>; ☆ varun khaneja <vakh@google.com>;wieland holfelder <holfelder-
        @google.com>;dominic battre <battre@google.com>;chrome privacy mu-
        c <chrome-privacy-muc@google.com>;adrienne porter felt <felt@goog-
        le.com>
CROSS_CONFIDENTIALITY: CONFIDENTIAL
CROSS_CUSTODIAN: Sabine Borsay
CROSS_DATECREATED:
CROSS_DATEMOD: 06/21/2016
CROSS_DATERECEIVED: 06/21/2016
CROSS_DATESENT: 06/21/2016
CROSS_DE-DUPED CUSTODIANS: Sabine Borsay
CROSS_ENDATTACH:
CROSS_ENDBATES: GOOG-CABR-00149428
CROSS_FILEEXTENSION: eml
CROSS_FILENAME:
CROSS_FROM: chris palmer <palmer@google.com>
CROSS_MD5 HASH: 7BBA5A9EB9777FBEF274C618BAFA125B
CROSS_MESSAGE ID: <CAOuvq20wUOup1zL3AdL46Ch86Jx+xfz19P+BN1epiOyP4Fpadg@mail.gmai-
        l.com>
CROSS_OWNER: palmer
CROSS_PRODVAL: CROSS-PROD002
CROSS_REDACTED: N
CROSS_SUBJECT: Re: █████] Google "Incognito" Precision

CROSS_TITLE: Re: [▮▮▮▮▮▮▮] Google "Incognito" Precision
CROSS_TO: sabine borsay <sabineb@google.com>
CUSTODIAN/SOURCE: Sabine Borsay
DATECREATED:
DATELASTMOD: 06/21/2016
DATERCVD:
DATESENT:
DeDupedCustodians:
DOCEXT:
FILENAME:
ILS_ProdDate: 07/16/2021
CROSS_ILS_ProdDate: 09/01/2021
MD5 HASH: 7BBA5A9EB9777FBEF274C618BAFA125B
MessageID:
NATIVEFILE:
Owner: palmer
PAGES:
REDACTED: N
SUBJECT: Re: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Google "Incognito" Precision

group.
To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it, send an email to
████████+unsubscribe@google.com.
To post to this group, send email to ███████@google.com.

--

| | | sabineb@google.com |

--

| | | sabineb@google.com |